



**CALIFORNIA  
HIGH-SPEED RAIL  
AUTHORITY**

**BOARD MEETING MINUTES  
(DRAFT) May 5, 2011  
Sacramento City Council Chambers  
Sacramento, California**

The public meeting of the California High-Speed Rail Authority was called to order on May 5, 2011 at 9:09 am at Sacramento City Hall.

Members Present:      Curt Pringle, Chairman  
                            Thomas Umberg, Vice-Chairman  
                            Lynn Schenk  
                            Tom Richards  
                            Matt Toledo  
                            Bob Balgenorth  
                            Russell Burns  
                            Jim Hartnett  
                            David Crane

**Pledge of Allegiance:**

The pledge of allegiance was administered by Vice-Chairman Umberg.

Chairman Pringle Introduced and welcomed two new Board Members. Bob Balgenorth and Jim Hartnett.

**Agenda Item #1 Public Comment**

An opportunity for public comment was provided. Positive support for High Speed was voiced, while concern was conveyed regarding the Grapevine alignment, wild land conservancy and challenges with the EIR.

**Agenda Item # 2 – Approval of Meeting Minutes**

Member Toledo made a motion for approval of the February 3, 2011 and March 3, 2011 meeting minutes. Mr. Umberg seconds the motion, with no objection motion passes unanimously. (8-0)

**Agenda Item # 3 – Executive/Administrative Committee Report**

Chairman Pringle discussed that the Executive/Administrative Committee had met. There was an approval and vote to adopt meeting minutes without modification. There was also a review of the proposed legislation that may affect the Authority. The Committee will continue to maintain its monitor status on AB 1077. The Committee made a motion to support AB 292 and to oppose AB 1077, unless amended. The Committee approved the recommendation and language of establishing a formal arrangement with the High Speed Rail Authority and the LOSSAN Rail Corridor, in such as the Executive

Director or his or her designee will serve in an Ex-Officio capacity on the LOSSAN Rail Corridor Board. The Committee supported entering into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the United Kingdom. It was also reported that the Committee supported the direction of the Staff on the development of the Small Business/Disabled Veteran Business Enterprise (SB/DVBE) Policy. This effort will continue with a final policy being brought back before the Board for a vote in coming months.

Public comment was provided for this agenda item.

A motion was made to approve the action that was taken at the Executive/Administrative Committee meeting. Mr. Toledo so moved, seconded by Mr. Richards. Without objections, motion passes unanimously. (8-0)

**Agenda Item # 4 – Operations Committee Report**

Mr. Umberg reported that the Operations Committee had met. The only item of substantive consideration was the proposal of the concept study of the Grapevine alternative. The rationale for considering a Grapevine alternative is the potential lower cost with respect to the entire system and potential time savings. There were also concerns with respect to the Palmdale alternative where seismic concerns and issues with respect to support and opposition in the Palmdale area. The cost of the study would be approximately \$700,000 and will not stop the analysis of the Palmdale alternatives or any other alternatives. This study will take approximately four to six months.

Public comment was provided for this agenda item.

Mr. Umberg made a motion to recommend the approval of this conceptual study, seconded by Mr. Burns. Motion passed unanimously. (9-0)

**Agenda Item # 5 – Update on the San Francisco – San Jose Alternatives Section**

Deputy Director Dan Leavitt informed the Board that although the item was listed as an action item, this is an actual informational item and there is no formal action that needed to be taken at this time. The current agenda item provided an update of the phased implementation approach for the San Francisco to San Jose section. Mr. Leavitt introduced Tim Cobb that provided a detailed presentation on the options.

Public comment was provided for this item.

Chairman Pringle discussed that the item before the Board talks about further study. He suggested that he is not prepared to vote for this now. Mr. Pringle stated that he did not know why we would have to start studying something brand new and why we would spend another penny until as Mr. Hartnett had communicated, that we have clarity and know what we are moving forward with. Without any objections, this item will be continued to the next meeting agenda.

**Agenda Item # 6 – Supplemental Alternatives Analysis Report for San Jose - Merced**

Deputy Director Dan Leavitt introduced project manager Dave Manson. Mr. Manson provided an update and briefing of the analysis of the alignment and station alternatives for the San Jose to Merced section.

Public comment was provided for this agenda item.

Staff recommended the approval of the Supplemental Alternative Analysis Report. Member Schenk made a motion for adoption of staff recommendation, seconded by Member Richards, with no objection, motion passes unanimously. (8-0)

**Agenda Item # 7 – Supplemental Alternatives Analysis Report for Merced – Fresno**

Program manager Jeff Abercrombie addressed the Board that this is an action item that covers the Supplemental Alternatives Analysis previously approved at the August 2010 Board Meeting. Mr. Abercrombie introduced project manager Richard Wenzel who provided a presentation of alignment and station profile refinements for the Merced to Fresno section.

Public comment was provided for this agenda item.

The staff recommends approval of the Supplemental Alternatives Analysis. Member Richards made a motion for adoption of staff recommendation, seconded by Member Burns. Without objection, motion passes unanimously. (8-0)

**Agenda Item # 8 – Supplemental Alternatives Analysis Report for Fresno – Bakersfield**

Jeff Abercrombie introduced Bob Schaevitz who provided a presentation of value engineering modifications to existing alternatives for the Fresno to Bakersfield section.

Public comment was provided for this agenda item.

Staff recommended the approval of the modifications of the Alternative Analysis Report as reported. Member Burns made a motion for adoption of staff recommendation, seconded by Member Richards, with no objection, motion passes unanimously with Mr. Richards, Mr. Burns, Mr. Toledo, Mr. Hartnett and Chairman Pringle present. (5-0)

**Agenda Item # 9 – Members’ Report**

Member Hartnett requested that the CEO’s report for the next Board Meeting include a status of the Budget Hearing that Mr. van Ark was presently attending. Chairman Pringle agreed and requested that staff ensure that there is a report to the Board in regards to what happened in the Budget Hearing occurring simultaneously with the current Board Meeting.

**Agenda Item # 10 – Chief Executive Officer’s Report**

Chairman Pringle requested that this item be continued to the next meeting.

Without any other business before them, meeting adjourned at 12:40 pm by Chairman Pringle.